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**Background:** The Medtronic CoreValve® with Accuract delivery system (MCVAT) (Medtronic Inc., Minneapolis, MN) was introduced to aid deliverability. The aim was to compare short-term outcomes after transcatheter aortic valve implantation (TAVI) with both the original Medtronic CoreValve® delivery system (MCV) vs. the MCVAT.

**Methods:** All consecutive patients with native valve aortic stenosis undergoing transfemoral TAVI in our center from November 2007-May 2012 with either MCV or MCVAT were included. The 31 mm MCVAT became available in September 2011. Study objectives were the Valve Academic Research Consortium (VARC) outcomes.

**Results:** In total, 125 TAVI cases were included: 56% (n=70) MCV and 44% (n=55) MCVAT. There was a trend for patients treated with MCV to be older (79.7±6.7 vs. 77.5±6.9 years; p=0.072), but no other differences in baseline characteristics. Logistic EuroSCORE was respectively 24.6±16.5% in MCV vs. 24.0±15.6% in MCVAT (p=0.569) and STS score 9.3±9.6% vs. 8.7±8.2% (p=0.713). At 30 days, there were no differences between MCV and MCVAT respectively in all-cause (7.1% vs. 5.6%; p=0.721) or cardiovascular mortality (2.9% vs. 5.6%; p=0.449). In addition, myocardial infarction (2.9% vs. 0%; p=0.206) and stroke (0 vs. 1.8%; p=0.257) were similar. However, there were improvements in major vascular complications (17.1% vs. 3.6%; p=0.017), life-threatening bleeding (32.9% vs. 16.4%; p=0.036) and acute kidney injury (44.3% vs. 20.4%; p=0.005), leading to an improved combined safety endpoint (40.0% vs. 22.6%; p=0.042).

**Conclusions:** The MCVAT has improved safety endpoints compared to MCV, probably due to the learning curve. However, there is a higher rate of arrhythmia and PPM in this group, possibly due to the introduction of the 31 mm valve. Longer term follow-up and larger patient numbers are required.
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Annapoorna Kini1, Roxana Mehran2, Nilusha Gukathasan3, Ziad Sergie4, Valvuloplasty TCT-886 due to the learning curve. However, there is a higher rate of arrhythmia and PPM in this group had more patients with peripheral artery disease (22.0% vs 10.9%), coronary artery disease (64.4% vs 58.3%), carotid stenosis (23.2% vs 15. 7%), redo-operation (25.7% vs 18.1%) and neurological dysfunction (14.8% vs 10.4%) than in TF (all p<0.05). In TF more patients were seen with pulmonary hypertension (22.0% vs 15.5%, p<0.05). The mean EuroSCORE I in TA was 24.2% and in TF 22.3% (p=0.007). Mortality at three years in TA was 33.7% and 27.3% in TF.

**Conclusions:** With a dedicated, experienced heart team in a hybrid OR, patients with severe aortic stenosis can be treated with similar rates of mortality regardless of approach and despite the fact that one group has significantly more comorbidities.

**Background:** Balloon aortic valvuloplasty (BAV) is a palliative treatment for severe aortic stenosis (AS) that is increasingly performed as a bridge to transcatheter aortic valve replacement. We investigated the independent predictors of vascular complications in AS patients who underwent BAV.

**Methods:** We performed a retrospective review of consecutive patients who undergoing non-emergent, retrograde BAV at two high-volume US centers. We analyzed baseline and procedural characteristics as well as in-hospital outcomes according to the presence or absence of vascular complications, as classified by the Vascular Academic Research Consortium (VARC). Net adverse clinical events (NACE) were defined as composite of death, myocardial infarction, stroke and major bleeding.

**Results:** Among 428 BAV patients, the average age was 83 ± 9 years and 30 (7.0%) had vascular complications. Patients with vs. without vascular complications had higher rates of myocardial infarction (13.3% vs. 2.5%; p=0.001), stroke (6.7% vs. 0.3%; p<0.001), and NACE (33.3% vs. 9.8%; p<0.001). Multivariable adjusted predictors of vascular complications are shown in the Figure.

**Conclusions:** In this large registry of BAV patients, pre-close failure, thrombocytopenia and concurrent PCI were associated with increased risk of complications in patients undergoing BAV.